

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JOHN DOES #1-5 AND MARY
DOE,

Plaintiffs,

v

No. 2:12-cv-11194

RICK SNYDER, Governor of the
State of Michigan, and COL.

HON. ROBERT H. CLELAND

KRISTE ETUE, Director of the
Michigan State Police, in their
official capacities,

MAG. DAVID R. GRAND

Defendants.

FINAL JUDGMENT

In this action Plaintiffs John Doe #1-5 and Mary Doe challenged the constitutionality of Michigan's Sex Offender Registration Act ("SORA"). *See* First Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 46, Pg. ID 840). Over the course of the litigation, the court has entered three substantive opinions and orders deciding the merits of Plaintiffs' claims. The three orders include:

1. Order on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Original Complaint. On March 18, 2013, the court entered an Opinion and Order (Dkt. # 27, Pg. ID 669) Granting in Part and Denying in Part

Defendants' Amended Motion to Dismiss.

2. Order on the Parties' Rule 52 Cross-Motions for

Judgment. On March 31, 2015, the court issued an Opinion and Order (Dkt. # 103, Pg. ID 5875)¹ Resolving Motions for Judgment (under Rule 52).²

3. Order Resolving Two Rule 52 Issues Left Undecided.

On September 3, 2015, the court issued an Opinion and Order (Dkt. #118, Pg. ID 6015) Resolving [Two] Outstanding Issues Raised in Plaintiffs' and Defendants' Motions for Judgment.

Because all Plaintiffs' claims are now resolved, the court enters this final judgment, awarding judgment in part to Plaintiffs and in part to Defendants, as set forth in the court's three opinions and orders listed above. This judgment triggers the time to appeal the court's

¹ Defendants have filed an appeal of this order to the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), which permits interlocutory appeals of injunctive relief granted by the district court.

² To the extent that Count IX of the First Amended Complaint (Dkt. 46, ¶382, Pg. ID 910) raised a claim that the 2011 iteration of SORA, combined with Public Act 149 of 2013, violates the Ex Post Facto Clause of the U. S. Constitution, and to the extent that the Court did not explicitly address that claim in its March 2015 Rule 52 Order (Dkt. # 103, Pg. ID 5940-45), the Court grants judgment to the Defendants for the reasons articulated in the March 2013 Order on the Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. # 27, Pg. ID 674-83).

opinions and orders (as to all issues decided by the Court other than the injunctive relief already appealed). The court has also entered a Stipulated Order (Dkt. # 120, Pg. ID 6032) deferring the parties' motions for costs and attorney fees until after all appeals are concluded.

This is the final order in the case, and judgment is entered as set forth above.

SO ORDERED.

s/Robert H. Cleland

Hon. Robert H. Cleland
U. S. District Judge

Dated: October 21, 2015

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record and/or pro se parties on this date, October 21, 2015, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Lisa Wagner
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk
(313) 234-5522